

LIBERTY BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DISTANCE LEARNING PROGRAM

AN EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 5:12-17

A PAPER
PRESENTED TO DR. LEO PERCER
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE COURSE
GREEK TOOLS
NGRK 506

BY
DAVID TACK
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

JULY 18, 2010
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Historical/Cultural Overview	1
Results of Adam’s Transgression: Rom. 5:12	3
One Sin	4
Introduction of Death	5
Spread of Sin to Humanity	5
Parenthetical Break: Rom. 5:13	6
Conjunctive Interludes	6
Imputation	7
Absolute and Mosaic Laws	7
Figure of Him to Come	8
Antithetical Comparison Between Adam and Christ: Rom. 5:15-17	9
Two Actions: Adam’s Offence and God’s Gift: Rom. 5:15	9
Two Results: Condemnation and Justification: Rom. 5:16	10
Two Ultimate Effects: Death Reigned and Reign in Life: Rom 5:17	13
Conclusion	14
Appendix 1	16
Biography	17
Certification Sheet for Exegesis	18

Introduction

In Romans 5: 12-17 we have an antithetical comparison between the two Adams which represent two divergent finalities for humanity. The inferior condemning act of first Adam (of creation) is antithetically contrasted with the super abounding justifying act of the second Adam, Jesus Christ. E.F. Harrison validates the Pauline antithetical contrast by imparting an additional supporting Pauline passage: “The Book of Romans is often restricted to a treatise on the doctrine of justification; but, to limit Romans to one cardinal doctrine would certainly serve as an injustice towards the epistle regarding it within its totality. Moo states, “We must not forget that Romans as a whole is a *letter*, written on a specific occasion, to a specific community.”² Our text of study, Romans 5:12-17, clearly includes vital multidimensional doctrines such as: Theology Proper; Anthropology; Christology; Soteriology; and Hamartiology. The doctrinal weightiness of Romans, and our text: Rom. 5:12-17, can be problematic in interpretation without methodical considerations in historical, cultural, grammatical and theological analysis. This exegetical paper will exegete the following subjects of Romans 5:12-17: historical/cultural overview; results of Adam’s transgression; the parenthetical break of Rom. 5: 13- 14; and the antithetical comparison between Adam and Christ.

Historical/Cultural Overview

To properly interpret any portion of Scripture; the writer, audience, purpose and genre should be carefully examined. In Rom. 5:12-17, the writer is the Apostle Paul and there is little scholarly debate on this fact. A complement passage regarding the writing of Romans can be

¹ Everett Harrison, “Romans.” In *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*. Vol. 10. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) 61.

² Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans, The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 14.

found in “Luke’s narrative in Acts 20:3-6.” Luke places the writing towards the “end of the third missionary journey” thus, supporting Pauline authorship.”³ It should not be considered slight that the author names himself as “Paul” and further identifies himself as “called to be an apostle” (Rom. 1:1).”⁴ Additionally, we have similarities found in other “known” Pauline epistles; such as: 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

Consequently, in regards to authorship we have the statement of the author, Luke’s narrative account in Acts; and, the similarities found in other “known” Pauline epistles.

The intended audience of the letter Romans is mixed to include both Jew and Gentile with the proportions of each group being disputed by scholars. Stott notes the diversity of the audience undoubtedly caused difficulties between the groups, resulting not so much from “ethnic” but from “theological” disputes.⁵ The letter steadfastly addresses both parties; and to confine Romans to one particular audience would diminish the purposeful design of its authorship. Moo remarking on the historical expulsion of Jews under Claudius states, “Christianity in Rome began among the Jews... we can be certain that by the date of Romans at least some Jewish Christians (like Priscilla and Aquila) would have returned.”⁶ In defense of Paul’s appeal to a Gentile audience we find references made in Rom. 11:13; 1:5; 15:15 and the letter is dotted with information pertaining to both parties. In defense of a Jewish audience, Rom. 9 is exclusively Jewish in content.

The objective for the letter of Romans is wide ranging and it would be unthinkable to restrict it to one particular subject. Moo indicates numerous potential intentions regarding the mission

³ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2.

⁴ All Scripture quotations taken from the *King James Version* unless otherwise noted.

⁵ John Stott, *Romans, God’s Good News for the World* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994) 34.

⁶ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 9.

of Paul's letter to the Roman Christians: "Romans has several purposes... the past battles in Galatia and Corinth; the coming crisis in Jerusalem; the desire to secure a missionary base for his work in Spain; the need to unify the Romans around "his" gospel to support his work in Spain."⁷ All of these reasons are quite plausible and should be equated when the purpose of this letter is questioned. Therefore, it is rational to acknowledge that Paul is dealing with opposing factions of mixed audiences in Rome. Furthermore, Paul is attempting to mediate through some of the differentiating tensions. Keener states, "given the situation, what Roman Christians needed was what we would call radical reconciliation and crosscultural sensitivity."⁸

When considering the genre style, it must be surmised that Romans was a "tractate letter" which "addresses key theological issues against the backdrop of middle first-century."⁹ Keener describes the genre as, "deliberative" rhetoric, an argument intended to sway the recipients to change their behavior and attitudes.¹⁰

Results of Adam's Transgression

Before we delve into the contextual and theological aspects of this portion of Scripture; there are differing opinions in regards to the Greek preposition διὰ *dia*, "wherefore." Murray makes this assertion, "a close logical connection between the passage and that which precedes is shown by the "therefore" with which verse 12 begins"; thus, allowing the connection to what Paul has already previously stated in this chapter.¹¹

⁷ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 20-21.

⁸ Craig S. Keener, *The Bible Background Commentary, New Testament* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 413.

⁹ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 14.

¹⁰ Keener, *The Bible Background Commentary, New Testament*, 413.

¹¹ John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans, Vol 1. The New International Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 180.

One Sin

One finds in Rom. 5:12 that the Greek word for sin (αμαρτια, *hamartia*) is a noun that is in the singular form. The first point noted is the singularity of sin is referring to “just one.” The term “by one man” found in Rom 5:12, is a reference to the first Adam of creation because in Rom. 5:14 it talks specifically of “Adam’s transgression.” Secondly, Schreiner accentuates the multiple mentions of Adam’s transgressions: “Five times the outcome of Adam’s trespass is hammered home: “many died” because of his sin (v. 15); his sin brought “condemnation” to all (v. 16); “death reigned” over all human beings (v. 17); all people were condemned because of his one trespass (v.18); and by virtue of his sin “many were constituted sinners (v.19).”¹² The emphasis Paul is placing regarding the consequence of Adam’s sin and the timeless impact on humanity is what is being stressed here. One last item worth mentioning is the cultural aspect of the Jewish mindset. Stott terms the Jewish culture as, “a collective solidarity of the extended family, tribe, nation, and race” which differentiates from the mindset of “western individualism.”¹³ There are numerous biblical examples of collective solidarity: “Abraham and king-priest Melchizedek; Achan and the stolen Jericho treasure; Pilate and the cross of Jesus” are just a few.¹⁴ Consequently, it would be an acceptable thing in the Jewish culture to believe that by one man’s transgression, humanity was condemned.

Introduction of Death

¹² Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, 268.

¹³ John Stott, *Romans*, 153.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 153

In Rom. 5:12 it is announced that sin introduced death to mankind. We find in Rom. 5:12 that the Greek word for the noun death (θάνατος, *thanatos*) is in the nominative case; meaning the subject [death] completes the activity of an active verb [passed]. Schreiner sees death as “separation” and “alienation” from God; thus, entering the world “immediately” through Adam’s sin (Ref: Gen. 3).¹⁵ Furthermore, Schreiner sees death as a nature received as a result of Adam’s transgression and justifies this concept through other Bible passages: “Eph. 2:1; cf. Eph. 2:3, 5; Col. 2:13.”¹⁶ Lastly, we have multiple references throughout our text passage, Rom. 5: 12-17, that validate the universal entrance of sin into the world is through the “single” transgression of Adam.

Spread of Sin to Humanity

In regards to sin, the last point of deliberation is the “spreading” of sin throughout humanity. We notice a transition in the later part of Rom. 5:12 where it states: “death passed upon all men.” There are many different interpretations; but, two primary interpretations are the Pelagian and Augustinian interpretations. In regards to Pelagius, Elwell states: “Since each soul is created immediately by God, as Pelagius believed, then it cannot come into the world soiled by original sin transmitted by Adam.”¹⁷ Ericson corroborates Elwell by offering additional information about Pelagius’ interpretation: “Adam’s influence, if any, upon his descendents is merely that of a bad example; there is no other direct connection between Adam and the rest of the human race.”¹⁸ Therefore, we notice that Pelagius did not embrace the concept of inheriting a sin nature

¹⁵ Schreiner, *Romans*, 272.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 276.

¹⁷ Walter Elwell, ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 2001) 897.

¹⁸ Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 1998) 649.

from Adam. Augustine on the other hand believed mankind received an inherited sin nature from Adam, who represented a federal headship of mankind; thus, death spread to “all men” through the transgression of Adam. Murray points out that “if” Paul is advancing a Pelagius interpretation in Rom. 5:12-17, it is oppositional to the central idea of the epistle. Roman’s theme denies, “justification by works” and supports “life by the righteousness of the one, Jesus Christ.”¹⁹ From a contextual standpoint the remainder of our text, through Rom. 5:19 “demonstrate that human beings do not sin merely by imitating Adam’s example.”²⁰ Moo states, “the comparative clauses found in the remaining verses “that all sinned” must be given some kind of “corporate” meaning: “sinning” not as voluntary acts of sin in “one’s own person,” but sinning “in and with” Adam.”²¹ Lastly, we have additional biblical references to the universality of sin (Ref: 1 Kin. 8:46; Eccl. 7:20; Rom. 3:19, 23).

Parenthetical Break: Romans 5: 13 and 14

Conjunctive Interludes

Rom. 5:13-14 are parenthetical and elucidate what Paul has previously stated in Rom. 5:12. The initial transitional word in Rom. 5:13 “for” (*γάρ*, *gar*) is a Greek conjunction that gives reason or clarity for what was previously stated, in Rom. 5:12. Paul purposely emphasizes the imputation of transgression by institution of two laws: the Mosaic and God’s absolute law. In Rom. 5:12, Paul has just labored in great lengths to explain just why all have died through the sin of “one” man, Adam. Attention should be directed to the additional conjunctive tie found at the

¹⁹ Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 184.

²⁰ Schreiner, *Romans*, 275.

²¹ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 326.

beginning of Rom. 5:14. The English word “nevertheless” (ἀλλά, *alla*) is noted as a strong conjunctive adversative indicating, “the thought of verse 13 is preparatory to that of 14 and moves on to verse 14 as expressing what is of particular relevance to the subject.”²²

Imputation

Before advancing to Rom. 5:14, one central word should be assessed: imputation (ελλογεται, *ellogeo*). Imputation comes from the Greek word ελλογέω, *ellogeo* and is only utilized twice: Rom. 5:13 and Phm. 1:18. The word imputation can be defined as a word that “is taken from the world of commerce and suggests the careful, specific, rendering of accounts necessary in bookkeeping (cf. H. Preisker, TDNT II, 516-17; MM).”²³

Absolute and Mosaic Laws

There are two points to consider, concerning the Mosaic Law. First, when approaching Adam’s act of sin and the entrance of death: sin pre-dates the Mosaic Law. Likewise, death also existed, pre-dated and continued up until the giving of the Mosaic Law. Another key clause found in Rom 5:14 is “even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.” This is an important clause because it lays the groundwork for the “such as” contrasts which will be applied in latter verses. Consequently, it will support Adam’s sin as having federal headship implications on humanity as a whole. The Pre- Mosaic biblical accounts of major events: such as the Noahic flood and Sodom and Gomorrah evidence that death was present before the reception of the Mosaic Law. Torrey refers to this pre-existing law as “the

²² Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 187.

²³ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 232.

absolute and perpetual Law of God” which was given to Adam in Gen 2:16, 17.²⁴ Murray adds, “Paul does not say nor does he allow that it was one in which law was not operative nor one in which there was no sin nor one in which sin was not imputed.”²⁵ Moreover, Torrey makes some important distinctive classifications regarding the Mosaic Law: It was to the Jews (Psa. 78:5; Duet. 4:8); Jesus bore the curse of it (Gal. 3:13); and, it was a schoolmaster leading to Christ (Gal. 3:24).²⁶ Thus, it can be seen by the comparison of other Scripture, many of them Pauline, the Mosaic Law was different in design and function than the Law of God. This is why Paul stated “whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam.” Paul promotes Adam as a figure; therefore, having federal headship implications regarding his “one” transgression.

Figure of Him to Come

Paul finalizes this two verse parenthetical thought by referring to Adam as a “figure of him that was to come” Jesus Christ (Rom 5:14). The word “figure” (type in the ESV, Rom. 1:14) is from the Greek word τύπος (*typos*) and is defined by Moo as follows: “τύπος means originally the impression made by striking something, and comes, thereby, to designate a form, pattern, or example.”²⁷ One might presume the phrase “of him to come” to be a reference to the second coming of Christ (Rom. 5:14). Schreiner views this as implausible: “The reference to “the coming one” (τοῦ μέλλοντος) should be understood from the perspective of Adam. In other words, from Adam’s standpoint in history Jesus Christ was the one to come...”²⁸

²⁴ R.A. Torrey, *The New Topical Textbook*. (Murfreesboro: Sword of the Lord, n.d) 152.

²⁵ Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 190.

²⁶ Torrey, *The New Topical Textbook*, 153.

²⁷ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 334.

²⁸ Schreiner, *Romans*, 280.

Antithetical Comparison between Adam and Christ: Rom. 5:15-17

In Rom. 5:15-17 we will be looking at some key terms that are essential in grasping the depth of the antithetical comparison between Adam and Christ. Murray gives the following fundamental thoughts for each verse: “abounding of grace (vs. 15); the justifying act (vs. 16); and, rule of life (vs. 17)”²⁹ Before consideration is made, the introductory conjunction should be examined. Mark how Rom. 5: 15 begins with the words, “but not as”; which, contains the strong adversative conjunction “but” (ἀλλά, *alla*). In review, Rom. 5:12 focuses upon: Adam’s sin, death’s introduction into the world; and, sin’s spread to all of humanity. Additionally, Paul providing an explanatory parenthetical interlude in Rom. 5:13-14.

Two Actions: Adam’s Offence and God’s Gift: Rom. 5:15

Here, in Rom. 5:15, Paul begins to make an antithetical comparison between the inferior Adamic type and the superior Christ type. The “but not as” is followed by a negative comparison between “the offence of Adam” and “the free gift of God” (Rom. 5:15). One derives our English word “offence” (of Adam), from the Greek noun (παράπτωμα, *paraptōma*) “meaning to fall” or what is known as the fall of humanity. Secondly, one derives our English word “gift” from the Greek noun (χάρισμα, *charisma*) meaning “a favor received without merit” or what is known as saving grace. Moo comments, “In this verse, then, “gift” denotes not the gift given to the believer (as is usually the case in Paul), but the act of Christ himself considered as a “work of grace.”³⁰ Another grammatical device used by Paul to compare the differing nature of the two actions (offence and gift) is the usage of: a “protasis (“if...”) a conditional

²⁹ Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 197.

³⁰ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 335.

subordinating clause. The protasis is found in Rom. 5:15, “For (if) through the offence of one [Adam] many be dead.” The apodosis, the main clause, “but” is found in Rom. 5:16, “(but) the free gift [of God] *is* of many offences unto justification.” Here, Paul is underscoring this point: the free gift of God is superior and not like the offense of Adam. Moo remarks: “This point gains force from the observation that Paul in this passage always presents the effects of Adam’s act as a completed fact, while the effects of Christ’s act are always viewed as continuing or future (cf. vv. 17, 19, 21).”³¹

Two Results: Condemnation and Justification: Rom. 5:16

In Rom 5:16 Paul progresses from a negative comparison between the “nature of the two actions” found in Rom. 5:15; and, focuses on “their immediate results.”³² Though terms like: “but not as... so also” and “much more” are introduced “or implied” in Rom. 5:15, these terms gain momentum in Rom. 5:16-17, 20; thus, adding height towards the antithetical comparison of the two Adam’s. Stott comments on Paul’s usage of these aforementioned terms (not like) and (much more), “... The strength here is that God’s “one” free gift provided justification for many plural offenses. Divergently, Adam’s singular offence condemned all of humanity. Because of the demarcation between the two; in Rom. 5:16, Paul makes reference to God’s “free gift” and grace as being in “abundance” (περισσεια, perisseia). The word used for abundance promotes a deeper inference of super-abundance. Schreiner shows Paul’s intentional focus regarding the exclusive nature of the gift “grace” by pointing out its repetitive usages through numerous terms:

³¹ Ibid, 336.

³² Stott, *Romans*, 154-155.

³³ Ibid, 149.

³⁴ Mounce, *Greek for the Rest of Us*, 83.

Paul communicates the wonder of God’s grace with the words “much more” (πολλῶ μᾶλλον, *pollo mallon*). He piles up a number of terms to emphasize God’s beneficence in this verse (and succeeding verses). Note the words χάρισμα (*charisma*, gift), χάρις (*charis*, grace), δωρεά (*dorea*, gift), χάριτι (*charity*, grace), and ἐπερίσσευσεν (*eperisseusen*, abounded).³⁵

The “much more” of God’s grace is expressed through a rich array of Greek terms. The trespass unto condemnation (Rom. 5:16) is followed by the connective conjunction “but” (δε, *de*) and carries the idea of an adversative transition, though it is weaker than the conjunction (ἀλλά, *alla*). Mounce defines (δε, *de*) as: “an “adversative” [coordinating] conjunction because it contrasts the following with the preceding. However, δε is a “weak” adversative, which means it usually indicates a slight adversative relationship.”³⁶ Furthermore, in Rom. 5:16, the conjunction (δε, *de*) provides the necessary antithetical comparative link between the “many offenses” and “justification.” Offences (αῤαπποματων, *paraptoma*) is a plural noun in the genitive case. Interestingly, Schreiner defines genitive in Rom. 5:16 as being “epexegetic.”³⁷ The preceding clause, “the free gift is of many offences unto justification.” Note the significance regarding the contrastive nature between the free gift unto “justification” and the trespass unto “condemnation.” The word justification is used 10 times in the New Testament; five of those occur in the Epistle of Romans. The English word “Justification” found in Rom. 5:16, is only one of the four English words translated from the Greek word δικαίωμα, *dikaiōma*. The sole place where δικαίωμα, *dikaiōma* is translated “justification” is in our study text, Romans 5:16. Additionally, in Rom. 5:16, “the gift is emphasized “unto justification.” Here the prepositional

³⁵ Schreiner, *Romans*, 284.

³⁶ Mounce, *Greek for the Rest of Us*, 84.

³⁷ Schreiner, *Romans*, 286.

word “unto” (εἰς, eis) conveys the idea of “resulting in” justification.³⁸ Mounce defines a preposition as, “a word that indicates the relationship between two words.”³⁹ So, in Rom. 5:16 the word “unto” connects the many offences “unto” the gift of “justification.” Concluding, Murray sums up Rom. 5:16 like this; “The free gift” is antithetical to “the judgment” – the judgment is unto condemnation, the free gift is unto justification.”⁴⁰

Two Ultimate Effects: Death Reigned and Reign in Life: Rom 5:17

In Rom. 5:15 Paul highlighted differences in “actions,” Rom. 5:16 contrasted “results”; and, Rom. 5:17 focuses upon antithetical comparisons in “ultimate effects” or reigns.⁴¹ Rom. 5:17 begins with a conditional clause, “for if by one man's offence death reigned by one.” Here the protasis “if” (εἰ, ei) is a first class conditional clause which is used “for statements and questions of fact.”⁴² Note, the answer to Rom. 5:17, the “then” clause “apodosis” will ultimately be answered in Rom. 5:18 “so by.” Observe what follows the protasis of Rom. 5:17 (for if): “by one man's offence death reigned by one.” Paul continues in Rom. 5:17, “much more” to describe the antithetical comparison, “they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ.” Remember in the beginning of Rom. 5: 17, Paul stated because of, or as a result of, Adam’s [one] offense “death reigned.” The word reigned (εβασιλευσεν, basileuō) is in the aorist active indicative and Moo remarks: “The aorist e=basivleusen may be ingressive --- “death took up its reign” (Z-G, 471) --- but is probably

³⁸ J.D. Douglas, ed. *The New Greek/English Interlinear New Testament* (Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 1990) 545.

³⁹ Mounce, *Greek for the Rest of Us*, 47.

⁴⁰ Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 196.

⁴¹ Stott, *Romans*, 154-155.

⁴² Mounce, *Greek for the Rest of Us*, 105.

constantive, embracing the whole period of death's reign."⁴³ Notice the different variant of the word used for the "much more" to life reign. The word reign (βασιλευσουσιν, basileuō) "in Life" is future active indicative; Moo elaborates: "Because Paul uses a future verb to depict the reigning of those who receive the gift, most think that the reference must be to the eschatological future."⁴⁴ Moo goes on to qualify this additional possibility: though the fact [eschatological future] cannot be denied, it should be noticed that this reception could also start at the "gift of the reception of righteousness."⁴⁵ The reign of death, brought on in Rom. 5:12 is brought about by the unrelated act of "one" sin through Adam; contrastingly, the reign of grace and life is a personal choosing and must be received by the recipient. It is available to all men; but, effort on each individual's part is essential for acceptance.

Conclusion

Adam brought sin and death into the world, through his one act of disobedience. Adam's act caused spiritual separation and physical death to all of humanity (Rom. 5:12). Christ brings the gift of grace and provides justification and "reigning unto life" to those who will accept. It is through Adam and his "one" transgression that sin entered the world and spread to humanity. Sin in reference to Adam is singular and Paul mentions five times, Rom. 5:15-19, that provides definiteness that it is in fact Adam's transgression that is being spoken of. Jewish culture supports the concept of collective solidarity. To accept the Pelagian interpretation of transmission of sin, by example, would miss the overall concept of the letter to the Roman Christians: justification by grace through one man, Jesus Christ. Contextualization of the

⁴³ Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 339.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 340.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 340.

remaining comparative clauses found in Rom. 5:12-17 equate to a corporate meaning.

Consequently, the Augustinian interpretation of an inherited Adamic universal sin nature is weightier than that of Pelagius'.

In the parenthetical portion of Rom. 5:13, 14 the pre- Mosaic presence of sin and death is addressed by the Apostle Paul. The absolute and perpetual law of God is the law given to Adam in Gen. 3:16, 17 and the distinctive functions of the Mosaic Law served a different unique Jewish purpose. It is the Adam's one transgression of the absolute Law of God that caused the death of mankind, not the Mosaic Law. Paul completes his parenthetical break by introducing Adam as a figure (or type) of Jesus Christ; thus, the stage is set for the antithetical contrasts found in the remainder of our study text, Rom. 5:15-17.

Rom. 5:15 begins the antithetical comparisons and accentuates the superiority of God's free gift over Adam's offense. Paul stresses Adam's act of transgression as a "one time" completed act while Christ's act is seen as continuing and futuristic. The contrasting comparison moves from "one of actions" offense and gift (Rom. 5:15) to one of results: condemnation and justification (Rom. 5:16). Lastly, Rom. 5:17 compares "ultimate effects, or reigns, that result from the two types: Adam and Christ. Through Adam, death reigned; much more, those who receive God's gift will reign in life. The life reigning in Christ is future active indicative and speaks of a constant reigning that will be completed in the future.

In summarization, Rom. 5: 12-17 clearly teaches that man inherited Adamic sin nature, was introduced to mankind through Adam. The results of Adam's sin included: physical and spiritual death; thus, death will reign if one remains outside of God's supreme, super-abundant, gift of grace. God's super-abundant gift is superior, when compared to the first Adam's transgression of condemnation. The gift makes provisional steps through Christ unto justification and

provides a reigning of life to all of those who will accept. Grammatically, theologically, and systematically the Augustinian view is the closest interpretation to the intended meaning of Rom. 5:12-17; though it would be truly subjective to say Augustine was totally accurate without marginal errors in his interpretative and exegetical conclusions.

Appendix 1

Lesson Plan: Romans 5:12-17

Main Theme: Two federal headships: The contrasting supremacy of Christ's "much more" super-abounding" free gift of justification and righteousness; with, Adam's singular condemning transgression.

SIN: INTRODUCTORY ASSERTIONS

- 1) Entrance of sin
 - a) Agency: Through Adam: Into the world
 - b) Sphere: Into the World
- 2) Effects of Sin
 - a) Result: Death
- 3) Scope of sin
 - a) Measure: Upon all men
 - b) Conclusion: All have sinned

SIN: IN RELATION TO THE LAW (vs. 13- 14c)

- 1) Time: Before knowledge of the (Mosaic) Law
 - a) Association: Sin was present
 - b) Condition: Death reigned
- 2) Design of the Law
 - a) Result: Imputation for transgression
 - b) Condition: No Mosaic Law present
 - c) Problem (14b): Death reigned from Adam to Moses.
 - i) Progression: Over them that had not sinned

SIN AND ADAM'S RELATIONSHIP (vs. 14d)

- 1) Explanation: A figure of him to come (Federal Headship)

ADAM'S SIN CONTRASRED WITH CHRIST'S GIFT (vs. 15)

- 1) Negative contrast between Adam and Christ
 - a) Cause: Adam's one offense
 - i) Result: Many are dead
 - b) Cause: Christ's free Gift
 - i) Result: Abounded to many

RESTATEMENT: CHRIST'S SUPERIORITY (vs. 16)

- 1) Negative Contrast
 - i) Inferior Summarization: The one sin (Adam) caused judgment/condemnation
 - ii) Superior Summarization: The gift (Jesus Christ) caused justification/righteousness

CONCLUSION: (vs.17)

- 1) Final Demise: Adam's Offense (Death Reigned)
- 2) Final Glory: Christ's abundance of grace; gift of righteousness: (reign in life)

Bibliography

- Douglas, J.D, ed. *The New Greek/English Interlinear New Testament*. Carol Stream: Tyndale House, 1990.
- Elwell, Walter, ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 2001.
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 1998.
- Harrison, Everett F. "Romans." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Vol. 10. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Bible Background Commentary, New Testament*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans, The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Mounce, William D. *Greek for the Rest of Us*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans, Vol 1. The New International Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans, Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academics, 1998.
- Stott, John. *Romans, God's Good News for the World*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Torrey, R.A. *The New Topical Textbook*. Murfreesboro: Sword of the Lord, n.d.

Certification Sheet For Exegesis Papers

Font For this paper I have chosen to use the following font for the English Language Text:
The teacher would prefer New Times Roman.

Times New Roman 12 point Courier New 12 point
I understand that no other font is acceptable.

Greek Font I understand that any Greek font that is substantially the same size as the English font is acceptable. **You MUST transliterate the Greek words in parenthesis after the Greek font according to the chart on page 5 in the textbook. If you do not use the prescribed fonts listed under the Exegesis Paper Materials Folder. Please transliterate omega as (w). This is due to the fact that not all Greek fonts carry over when your paper is submitted.**

Title Page I understand that I must include a title page using the exact same font and font size as is used in the body of my paper.

yes no

Notes I understand that the notes must be in the same font as the body of the paper, although they may be 10 point rather than 12. I know that I cannot use Courier New for the body of the paper and Times New Roman for the foot notes or vice-versa.

yes no

For this paper I have chosen to use Endnotes Footnotes

In addition I know that I cannot use parenthetical notes, except for scripture references.

Proofreading I have proofread my paper carefully. I have looked for incomplete sentences, and have sought to make sure that every punctuation mark is used correctly. I have sought to avoid redundancies and unnecessary words (i. e. “particular” etc.). In addition I have used my spell checker and I have checked my spelling carefully myself.

yes no

Plagiarism

I understand that plagiarism is a crime and also a violation of Seminary policy. I have not used *any* sources in this paper without attribution. I have not used the exact words of *any* author without using quotation marks.

In addition, I know that violation of *any* of the above will result in severe penalties.

yes no